

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 12/29/2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 31-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and allowed claims 1-30. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

7. The Examiner rejects claims 31-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The Examiner considers the recitation of "the register format including an input block format and an output block format of the source block of code, ...and detecting a block format inconsistency between the source register and a target register of a target architecture" by independent claims 31, 41, and 51 at variance with paragraph [0015] of the Specification which states, "An instruction format inconsistency is detected between the source register and a target register of a target architecture by comparing the output block format to the input instruction format if the output block format asserts an access status of the source register."

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 31-60 are directed to "detecting a block format inconsistency between the source register and a target register" and not an instruction format inconsistency as in claims 1-30. As disclosed in the last sentence of paragraph [0015] of the Specification, "A block format inconsistency is detected by masking the format register with an input block format mask and then comparing the masked format register with the input block format." Embodiments of detecting block format inconsistency are described in paragraphs [0039]-[0040] and [0043]-[0058]. Applicant respectfully submits that these portions of the Specification demonstrate that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 31-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-30.

*Conclusion*

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/James Henry/

Dated: March 29, 2006

By \_\_\_\_\_

James Henry  
Reg. No. 41,064  
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)